



**ABERDEEN ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room  
Boston, MA, 02201

**OCTOBER 14, 2021**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** *Nakeeda Burns, John Bligh, Helen Pillsbury, Kirsten Hoffman, Sharon Cayley*

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** *Nicholas Armata, Senior Preservation Planner*

A full recording of the hearing is available at:

<https://www.boston.gov/historic-district/aberdeen-architectural-conservation-district>

---

**4:00PM** Chair N. Burns called the public hearing to order. She explained that, pursuant to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, that the public hearing was being conducted virtually via the online meeting platform Zoom in order to review Design Review applications. She also briefly explained how to participate in the online hearing.

Following this brief introduction she called the first application.

**I. VIOLATIONS**

**VIO # 22.0010 AB 24 SELKIRK ROAD**

Applicant: Ian Gleason

Proposed Work: Removal of oak tree without AACDC permission, changes to new construction design.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE:** *Ian Gleason*

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** *Photographs of existing conditions of the project, approved plans, new proposed plans.*

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** *Why the tree at the front of the property was removed, the type of tree, the need for the changes at the rear of the property, the impact the changes have on the historic elements of the property.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** *No public comment*



**J. BLIGH MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. N. BURNS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 5-0-0 (Y: NB, JB, SC, KH, HP) (N: NONE). THE PROVISOS STIPULATES THAT A NEW PIN OAK TREE WILL REPLACE THE TREE THAT WAS REMOVED WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE COMMISSION. THE TREE MUST BE NO LESS THAN 20 YEARS OLD.**

## II. DESIGN REVIEW HEARING

### **APP # 22.0416 AB 1930 BEACON STREET**

Applicant: David Lapidis

Proposed Work: Storefront restoration

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE:** *Allyson Rider*

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** *Photographs of existing conditions of the project, elevation plans*

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** *Paint color used, placement of signage, repair of any holes in existing historic masonry, previous approvals for same property*

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** *No public comment*

**S. CAYLEY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. N. BURNS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 5-0-0 (Y: NB, JB, SC, KH, HP) (N: NONE). PROVISOS: APPROVAL PROVISOS STIPULATES THAT THAT NEW SIGNAGE WILL UTILIZE EXISTING HOLES WHERE POSSIBLE, THAT ANY UNUSED HOLES WILL BE REPAIRED AND REPAINTED, THAT ANY NEW MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE COMMISSION UNDER A NEW APPLICATION AND THAT EVERY EFFORT WILL BE MADE TO PLACE THE EQUIPMENT OUT OF SIGN.**

### **APP # 22.0440 AB 93 WILLISTON ROAD**

Applicant: Samuel Sokol

Proposed Work: Complete renovation of the property including new siding, new windows, new handrail, and new dormers.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE:** *Samuel Sokol, Peter Bartash*

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** *Photographs of existing conditions of the project, elevation plans, site plans, and material cut sheets*



**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** *existing conditions of property, proposed materials, appropriateness of the changes, window design, dormer design, restoration efforts, landscaping.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** *Eva Webster, expressed concern over approving any siding materials that was anything but cedar.*

**N. BURNS MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. H. PILLSBURY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-1 (Y: NB, SC, KH, HP) (N: JB).PROVISOS STIPULATES THAT THE PROPERTY WILL BE RE-SHINGLED USING (REAL) CEDAR SHAKE SHINGLES AS NECESSARY.**

## **II. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL**

**APP # 22.0355 AB 66 CHISWICK ROAD:** Spot brick repointing

**APP # 22.0278 AB 42 ENGLEWOOD ROAD:** Proposed work: Replace all side windows as indicated on application

*There was no public comment*

**S. CAYLEY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW APPLICATIONS AS SUBMITTED N. BURNS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 5-0-0 (Y: NB, JB, KH, HP) (N: NONE).**

## **II. RATIFICATION OF MEETING MINUTES FROM 8-12-2021**

**COMMISSIONER PILLSBURY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, COMMISSIONER BURNS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 5-0-0 (Y: NB, JB, SC, KH, HP) (N: NONE).**

## **III. STAFF UPDATES**

## **IV. ADJOURN -6:05 PM**

**J. BLIGH MOTIONED TO ADJORN THE HEARING. N. BURNS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 5-0-0 (Y: NB, JB, SC, KH, HP) (N: NONE).**